

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:**

The Office Action dated April 8, 2010 concluded as follows for the subject application:

- Claims 1, 5, 10-13, 15-16, 18-23, 25-26, and 28-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto et al. (U.S. 7,130,617) in view of Sellen et al. (U.S. 2001/0029175).

**103(a) Rejections:**

The Examiner cites Matsumoto in view of Sellen as rendering obvious independent claims 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, and 31. It is respectfully asserted that the cited references, whether viewed alone or in combination, do not suggest or disclose the subject matter of independent claims 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, and 31.

Each of the independent claims recites a similar distinction that is not found in the cited references.

Claim 1 states in relevant part:

wherein the reminder is entered into the memory of the mobile communications device by a remote terminal, which is remote from the mobile communications device.

Claim 5 states in relevant part:

to determine if the event is associated with a reminder item stored in a memory of the device by a remote terminal... wherein the device is a mobile communications device, and the remote terminal is remote from the mobile communications device.

Claim 10 states in relevant part:

storing the reminder with an application indicator and the identifier in a

memory of the mobile communications device by a remote terminal, which is remote from the mobile communications device.

Claim 15 states in relevant part:

storing the reminder with the or another application indicator in a memory, wherein the reminder is entered into the memory of the mobile communications device by a remote terminal, which is remote from the mobile communications device.

Claim 20 states in relevant part:

wherein the device is a mobile communications device, and the controller is further configured to allow the reminder to be entered into the memory of the mobile communications device by a remote terminal, which is remote from the mobile communications device.

Claim 25 states in relevant part:

to store the reminder with the or another application indicator and the identifier in a memory of the device by a remote terminal, wherein the device is a mobile communications device and the remote terminal is remote from the mobile communications device.

Claim 31 states in relevant part:

wherein the reminder is entered into the memory of the mobile communications device by a remote terminal, which is remote from the mobile communications device.

Matsumoto teaches a telephone which enables the user to convey recorded information to a

party without omission, even when the caller receives a call from the party after the original phone call which was not able to get through. The Examiner admits in the office action dated 4/8/2010 that Matsumoto fails to disclose the above quoted element of claim 1. The Examiner cites Sellen as rendering obvious this element of claim 1.

Sellen teaches a method of logging verbal reminders from a mobile user using a mobile device that can communicate with a mobile radio infrastructure. Sellen also teaches a service system for handling user-generated reminders.

The Examiner asserts that paragraph [0040] in Sellen teaches the above quotation of claim 1. However, it is respectfully asserted that the Examiner misinterprets Sellen's disclosure. Sellen teaches in Figures 2 and 3 that a mobile entity is used to pass a message to a service system 40. The service system 40 then records the message in digitized form in store 42. When the message is ended the call answer subsystem 41 passes the call details to the email server which forms an email including the recorded voice message. The email is then sent out over an email network and is downloaded by an email client 47 shown as running in a PC 46. Specifically, at paragraph [0040] Sellen discloses that a user records a reminder through a cell phone to a service system and the service system 40 records the message and forwards it in an email message to the email address specified by the user.

As is evident, the teachings of Sellen are contrary to the language of claim 1. In fact Sellen clearly shows a direct teaching away from the language of claim 1. Sellen discloses that a reminder is dictated directly into a cell phone and sent to a service system 40 and then to PC 46 through email. This is clearly contrary to the language of claim 1. Claim 1 states "the reminder is entered into the memory of the mobile communications device by a remote terminal". Clearly, Sellen's teaching of sending a dictated reminder via email is not analogous to "entered into the memory" as stated in claim 1.

Furthermore, the combination of Matsumoto and Sellen does not cure their individual shortfalls. Matsumoto teaches a telephone which enables the user to convey recorded information to a party without omission, even when the caller receives a call from the party

after the original phone call which was not able to go through. (col. 2, lines 3-8) Sellen, on the other hand, teaches sending a reminder via email from a cell phone to a PC. (abstract) It is unclear how the combination of Matsumoto and Sellen would work. However, one can speculate that Sellen's ability to send reminders from a cell phone to a PC via email could be integrated into Matsumoto's reminding unit. Nevertheless, this combination still lacks "wherein the reminder is entered into the memory of the mobile communications device by a remote terminal, which is remote from the mobile communications device" as stated in claim 1. Sellen's reminder would not be "entered into the memory of the mobile communications device" as recited in claim 1, but sent via email to a PC. As such, the references, whether viewed individually or in combination, fail to suggest or disclose "wherein the reminder is entered into the memory of the mobile communications device by a remote terminal, which is remote from the mobile communications device" as stated in claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore novel over the purported combination of Matsumoto and Sellen and is in condition for allowance.

As shown above independent claims 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, and 31 recite similar subject matter to that of claim 1. For the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1, independent claims 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, and 31 are also in condition for allowance.


In that all of the independent claims are clearly allowable, then all of the dependent claims are also clearly allowable for at least this one reason alone.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), and to allow all of the pending claims as now presented for examination. An early notification of the allowability of all of the pending claims is earnestly solicited.

S.N.: 10/551,886

Art Unit: 2617; Confirmation No.: 6802

Respectfully submitted:



Harry Smith  
Reg. No.: 32,493

6/15/2010  
Date

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, Attorneys at Law, LLC  
4 Research Drive  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203)925-9400  
Facsimile: (203)944-0245  
email: hsmith@hspatent.com

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

6-15-2010  
Date

  
Name of Person Making Deposit